

Minutes of Special Meeting of March 29, 2016
One Twin Pines Lane, Emergency Operations Center

ROLL CALL 4:00 P.M.

Councilmembers Present: Hurt, Stone, Lieberman, Kim (arrived 6:05 p.m.), Reed
Councilmembers Absent: None

OTHER BUSINESS

Housing Element Annual Progress Report (2015)

Management Analyst Rose reviewed the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Allocations for 2015. She pointed out that an affordable housing component will be included in the Belmont Village Specific Plan which was a requirement in order to receive grant funds. She clarified that HIP (Human Investment Project) Housing and HEART (Housing Endowment and Regional Trust) organizations are still providing housing assistance, both regionally and within Belmont. She pointed out that the City of Belmont's recent update to residential development standards are included in the report.

ACTION: On a motion by Councilmember Stone, seconded by Councilmember Hurt, and unanimously approved (4-0, Kim absent) to and direct staff to transmit the Housing Element Annual Progress Report for 2015 to the California State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)

STUDY SESSION

Review of Potential Affordable Housing Programs for the City of Belmont (continued from February 23, 2016)

Management Analyst Rose reviewed the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Allocations for 2015. She reviewed income limits by family size and summarized the impact and linkage fee structures and potential fee ranges.

In response to Councilmember Hurt, City Attorney Rennie clarified that 40 to 50 years is the typical length of time for deed-restricted homes that have been granted some form of subsidy.

Management Analyst Rose defined inclusionary fees. She noted that developers can produce units on site or pay into an affordable housing fund.

Discussion ensued regarding inclusionary zoning benefits and concerns. Discussion also ensued regarding the level of staff effort in managing affordable units for compliance with contractual obligations related to affordability and primary residence.

The City Council discussed potential uses of the affordable housing fund.

Councilmember Lieberman expressed support for on-site production of affordable units on larger development, and the imposition of in lieu fees for smaller projects. He suggested that five units

is the likely minimum number of affordable units that should be required. Council concurred.

Discussion ensued regarding: 1) housing partnerships with local nonprofit organizations; 2) options for program opportunities, including new construction, multi-family preservation, alternative mitigation, and city-owned land; 3) the city-owned property on Hill Street, and options for future development. Finance Director Fil explained that the finalization of the Belmont Village Specific Plan would help address this last matter.

Discussion ensued regarding the appropriateness of providing funding for housing projects outside of the city limits. Finance Director Fil pointed out that the request would likely come from county or partner housing agencies. Council concurred that it would entertain future discussions on potentially funding regional solutions that may be outside the city limits should the need arise.

Management Analyst Rose noted that proceeds of sale of existing city-owned properties would require use for low and very low income housing stock. City Attorney Rennie clarified that properties owned previously by the redevelopment agency are required to be used for LMI (low to moderate income housing). Management Analyst Rose confirmed that city-owned housing units that have been identified for potential sale are currently occupied. Discussion ensued regarding relocation issues.

Staff indicated that the inclusionary ordinance is a better tool for the production of moderate income housing, and rental property is likely better for low and very low income, due to additional expenses such as association fees associated with condominium ownership.

Council concurred that workforce housing is defined as affordable housing, and concurred to support housing options for public sector employees.

Mayor Reed pointed out that it is likely that little can be done relative to existing city-owned properties due to property size constraints.

(At this time, being 6:05 P.M., Councilmember Kim joined the meeting.)

Councilmember Kim expressed support for the production of work force housing. He pointed out the need to identify the problem to solve. He expressed a desire to develop policies that will ultimately lead to home ownership for current and future renters. He also suggested targeting which level of public sector employees for housing needs (entry, mid-career, or end of career).

Council summarized its support for the following aspects of affordable housing:

- Reaffirmed the disposition of assets as recommended by staff, and to expedite this matter
- linkage fees as recommended
- Fee ranges as outlined in the Nexus Study and feasibility analysis
- Inclusionary housing zoning
- Inclusionary zoning to promote on-site production, with a minimum five units as

threshold

- In-lieu fees for smaller projects

Discussion ensued regarding housing partners. Council concurred that it would consider regional solutions to meeting needs for LMI housing that benefits Belmont even if those housing units are produced outside Belmont city limits.

The City council expressed support for public employee workforce housing.

Evelyn Stivers, San Mateo County Housing Leadership Council, suggest that the City Council consider upzoning before acquiring any new property for housing purposes, and to have fees in place.

Nevada Merriman, Mid-Peninsula Housing Corporation, expressed her appreciation for the level and depth of discussion and consideration of this matter.

ADJOURNMENT at this time, being 6:30 P.M.

Terri Cook
City Clerk

Meeting audio recorded.